

12-5-6

Israel class it is the only country threatened
with destruction (of Jews)

But wait - Is there any w.
Jews (if Jews have how to develop Jews)

US, believe:

(about)
Munich, - from by efforts claim to
destroy to, if not it destroyed

But don't have the

(and, as evolution try control to
get the, they try on as a
course that will give the
the end to have the,

(on Holocaust: Are there not German
troops, officers, who confess, certainly,
personal participation in gas chamber ops

+ supplies of gasoline B

living camps

In other, legitimate history
(not for infinite chances) (photos)
PHOTOS

Whereas, no does the linking with.

Feeling? Explain? other?

[on other hand: do anti-Jewish all history in
Holocaust?

How far do they go into Postwar?

What is the social problem of Jews in US

12-13-06

Israel (US) position on Iran -

We will not allow ~~Iran~~ ^{Iran} with attack
on Iran ^U enriched process, with or
without inspection (although under NPT,
IAEA, int. law, it is allowed to have U-enriched
process with inspection)

(and ^{NNWS} X⁻ can't have it, X-I without
inspection; and US ~~was~~ proposed it to
Shah, in 1977?)

I or US will attack Iran if necessary to
prevent it - with nuclear weapons if needed

[i.e. we are using our nukes now
to protect our oil monopoly in ME;
we are using nukes to deter Iran from
exercising the option - with inspection, with the
NPT (but...? option?) - of having the NPT
subsequently not requiring nukes.

(i.e. ^{then} announcing its intention to exercise
nukes, a year or two? in advance. (or several years).
[from 5% to 80-95% for several weeks take how long?])

(C/A: there is no strong evidence ("proof") of
Iranian intentions that are not ^{or plausible} compatible with
the intention to have the option (within a year or
two of decision) of exercising, without the intention
or expectation of doing so within a particular
period.

with inspection, it can't do this secretly.

Without inspection, it can.

^{doctor}
Bashiri was attacked by Iraq
during war

Is. leadership is low quality -

Iran. are supporting fundamentalist leaders
in Hamas - ad approval of Hezbollah in
Lebanon

Is. supported Iraq War

Is will not act on its ~~own~~ own

Iran's security problem must be taken
into the picture

If Musharraf were shot Terrorism
New generation of generals are ~~the~~
Wahabis from madrasas

Is. fears:

Iran. concerns are the Arabs - 1000 years

1980-88 Arabs

attack

even US, UK, France

✓ Saleh bin Laden: his personal enemy is Iraqi nuclear
ambitions, of US leaves - Iraq, sending
Iraqi Arabs, wanting revenge -
a South-type Jew again (otherwise a
Semi-Skin) — and way to restore Iraq
but means

Work with the Arabs — not the Iranians
(King of Jordan from a "crescent of Shia")

Syria, maybe

US security guarantees

Iran on Afghan

Al Qaeda prison

don't bother with regime change

very tough negotiator. established protocol (+)
(talked in April)

in Oct, we are interested

are B+C "mod"? —

"total lack of strategic overview"

Condi Rice, Dick Bush, Cheney...

^{we}
(make deal with India — half cash
refugees — brain-drain)

if
if don't bother about half. consideration

mislead the whole community of NNWS

disarm the NPT —

Can. will vote in favor

US breaking rules of dealing w/ rec. tied to
Brazil, Argentina, Egypt, Iran,
Japan, South Korea

China will sell to Pakistan,
(offer from)

Congress has not even requested India
to sign that law

13-13-C

12-11-06 E. A. S. Iran will not give up, in agents^(?) of
without attack, enriched under inspection.

Alternatives:

1) — with instruments

It would accept heavy inspection,
(no regime change, ^{of US} assurance of no attack, normal
relations... Regime change of Iran — brief:
(vs. Chaudhury)

~~alternatives~~

— At present, IAEA inspection (inadequate)

— Sanctions, blockade — no inspection — crash program (?)
— will not cause suspension

for

— attack: retaliate, and

— or US " (resumed no-inspection crash production
after 4 months...)

state of
war

No resumption of inspection

(Iran gets better, Iran with Nasser bombing?)

No regime change

4)

Hyp: Iran has given up (yesterday, about 12-12-06;
Khatami, last week) its "obligation" — at cost of
exp. continuity for. unhelpful to US demand that
Iran not begin to join it —

(What threats will be made — by who — if Egypt
now decides to enrich? (in view of India-US deal?)

Want a minute — the Half States have "just
decided" to enrich: 12-10-06

Then, US position on Iran, + India deal (both
supported by Ben Laden (pro-Iran), i.e. Kerry — (Obama?)
have destroyed NPT [or, will IAEA inspection continue?]

12-13-06

to/US thinks will not cause fear
suspension of immigrant, and have been
& will be counter-productive
entirely negative, except
to increase (for US) the chance of a US attack.

An attack - to or US - will be disastrous,
esp. an attack (catastrophe, though not an
ultimate catastrophe: but one profit & use of
all kinds, untappable

(Abolition - and on the way to it - radical
reduction of danger (S-R + internationalism) -
inc. no more actual profit -
are not impossible, "materializable," as of
now (though there is almost no sign
of foreseeable (S-R) progress toward it, with
the contrary, strong movement away from it) -

es. Kruger but both could (soon, and quickly) become
materializable

(like German democracy after Feb 28 - June 1933
and, recently, war - even defeat, and
destruction, unless Adolf SU were not involved,
i.e. Hitler was assass.

(Here, in 2000: no revision of freq, from (?)
(and less chance of 9-11:
NO ONE NOTICES THIS!)

12-13-06

So, polo says: fund state will with
if few has, en inspired, a U-embled
process: pus will leave, unit come. Bad.

(o, meas - but that's 5-10 years off, give inspiration
only? ?

avoid that by new rule policy model with -
and of US.

// Will pus come to to, or stay,
AFTER ISRAEL ATTACK ON IRAN?
Will Israel - or US - be more, or less, safe after that?
(expect from long?)

What if all Arab states have meas? + immediately,
Can to prevent this? process!

Effect of attack, if it on US:
Is to the only US off - ME.

OK for to!

Not in interests of US!

High oil prices -

OK for oil carp, in S-R!

How long, and?

12-14-06

Is - Iran

Bush doesn't want prewar as he
thinks to attack Iran

he needs reasons to sell to Pentagon
+ Congress

Obama is giving him that

Why does he want it now - within
2 years (1 year)?

GWB (Hawk):
"only if..."
(With)
+ China

Hyp: If agree with GWB - he is the
man of destiny needed to attack Iran
(as, Iraq) - no successor can be counted
on to do it, is next 5-10 years
(~~that~~ Iran does have a new -
like SA, if sanctions were lifted)

If "my" wants Iran to (be provoked by Bush to)
leave NPT - so they can convince US they
as US must attack

CHAK to Soviet as reply to it in '73:
(Khrushchev)

Is + Iran (+ AQ?) get US to destroy Bosnia region
in Iraq

Is Is (will AQ help?) gets US to attack
Iran (see End of The Departed).

2, 12-13-06

So. "involvement" of our cap + will to use it
(preventively)

is aimed at, to influence, US.

(Perhaps then - it won't work - by
increasing its expectation of US
attack: instead of this,
"US won't let So. attack."

1) to make more credible, US concern,
"if we don't then (with B-2's, etc.)
So. will attack with missiles."

(Bush might not mind that - + might want
to use US ones! - but sort of Estab
(non-finish or Christian point) would not.

So the give Bush a public rationale (better
than a private warning - as in 1973?!) which
led only to US response, which forced us
public resistance) (did it risk war with SU?
surely?!)

For attacking Iran - makes it easier to do,
politically, and harder to resist doing it

- "If we don't, So. will attack with missiles."
"don't"

4. 12-13-66

to prevent forced from one attack on us
In this context, it will be harder for US
to cancel misses, ^{on us} even as ESC
- this point was to avoid misses.

Good; but it works a non-live attack more
likely.

(not show all the value of being misses as a
"Lowest Option.")

and it receives US misses of legitimacy of things.
Then, perhaps - at least - a two - round on the.

and most destructively influential
When I count the US as the chief sinner
on nuclear dangers, followed closely, in tone + scale, by
the SU/Russia

(all other NWS are very behind, i.e. Israel,
no worse than any other, no less "entitled" to
use EU "defense" or deter the enemy...

(If Israel did get nukes, Is. would certainly
be entitled (in count world) - an well-ordered -
to keep them, or get them if it didn't have them

(no new action to declare them would be necessary
to deter - from known.)

Declaration now is to convince Is. is not
so afraid of world opinion or the Arab response
as to be inhibited from carrying out its count
threats against Iran: of a nuclear Osirac
strike: (would against Natany).

"If you (US), don't ~~to~~ succeed at "detering" (threats)
(without recognizing Iran?!)
or assuring it.)

or ~~to~~ do what you can do to stop it (without
nukes) we will do what we have to do to
stop it - with nukes.)

(Ask: does Israel have any chance of
detering Natany without nukes?

(US does.)

Israel
"entitled"
to
"deter"
(not quite!)